

REMARKS

Claims 1-54 and 56-79 are pending and stand rejected. All pending claims are believed to be allowable over the references cited by the Examiner as discussed below. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for the present application is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 14-16, 26, 27, 33, 40, 45, 56-58, 60, 61, 66, 70, 71, 75 and 76 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Endick et al. (USPN 5,339,360) in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

Independent claim 1 generally recites a telecommunication system that includes a telephone headset, an accessory for the telephone headset, and a headset adapter coupled to both the headset and the headset accessory that directly controls the accessory for the telephone headset independently of the base telephone.

The Examiner contends that because Endick states "[t]he Report Specific ID (REPORT) command is issued by the Option Processor when it wants to request [information] from an option" (col. 9, lines 1-6), that Endick explicitly discloses that the option processor directly controls the options.

While the undersigned agrees that such statements by Endick may be confusing when taken alone, it is clear that Endick is referring to the "issuance" of commands by the option processor as either in response to a command or other condition (e.g., reset) from the base telephone or an option or a mere distribution of messages to the options. Thus, the option processor neither directly nor independently control or monitor the option as generally recited in independent claim 1.

In particular, Endick states in no uncertain terms that "the option processor distributes messages to options and the base processor." (Col. 6, lines 50-52). Immediately prior to presenting an example of a command set that includes the NOP, RESET, REPORT, etc. commands, Endick again states that:

An example of a command without associated data is an indication that the PBX issued a "phone reset". An example of a command with associated data is communication of a ROLMlink command. An example of a command with a request for data is a request for an option ID. Either the telephone or an option can issue any of the above-described types of commands."

(Col. 8, lines 41-47, emphasis added). Endick then sets forth an example of a command set (col. 8, lines 48). Clearly, Endick states that either the telephone or an option, and not the option processor acting directly and independently, can issue any of such commands. Indeed, Endick makes no mention of any utility in having the option processor act independently, e.g., for what purpose would the option processor independently request an option ID.

The fact that Endick's option processor does not directly nor independently control the options is further evidenced by the flow of a command message as shown by Endick in FIG. 7. As shown in FIG. 7, the flow of a command message is from the PBX to the option processor 702 of the microprocessor 118 then to the various options 704, 706 (in order of priority) and finally to the base processor 708 of the microprocessor 118. As is evident, the option processor 702 is clearly not directly nor independently controlling or monitoring the headset adapter as recited in the claims. Rather, it is the PBX that is controlling by sending command messages via the option processor.

RESET Command Issued by the Option Processor

With respect to the RESET command, Endick explicitly states that the option processor issues a RESET command "whenever a microcontroller reset occurs." (Col. 8, lines 66-68). Endick describes reset events as being "within the telephone such as power on" (col. 6, lines 3-5; see also col. 5, lines 39-42 and col. 10, lines 3-4) or when the PBX issues a "phone reset" (col. 8, lines 41-42).

In other words, even if the option processor originates the issuance of the RESET command, such issuance of the RESET command is clearly in response to a microcontroller reset. Thus, the option processor is neither directly controlling the options nor is it controlling the options independently of the base telephone, as generally recited in independent claim 1, for example.

REPORT Command Issued by the Option Processor

Similarly, with respect to the REPORT command issued by the option process (Col. 9, lines 1-6), the only example of a request for such information provided by Endick is made by the PBX (see example at Col. 7, lines 24-55 and in particular, lines 36-55). In particular, Endick describes that a request by the PBX for a phone ID is sequentially relayed by the option processor to the various options, each option imparting its response on top of the message. In other words,

even if the option processor originates the issuance of the REPORT command, such issuance of the REPORT command is clearly in response to a request from the PBX. Thus, the option processor is neither directly controlling the options nor is it controlling the options independently of the base telephone, as generally recited in independent claim 1, for example.

Independent claim 15 similarly recites an adapter base for a telecommunications headset coupled to an accessory for the headset; independent claim 26 recites a headset accessories interface bus coupled to a headset accessory; independent claim 33 recites an interface bus for a headset adapter and a headset accessory; independent claim 40 recites a method using a headset adapter base and an interface bus; independent claim 56 recites a communications protocol for a headset accessories interface bus; independent claim 66 recites a combination having a headset adapter and a communications protocol; independent claim 70 recites a headset adapter base for testing a headset accessory; and independent claim 75 recites a method for testing a headset accessory using a headset adapter. With regard to these independent claims, Endick similarly fails to disclose the elements relating to the headset accessory and headset adapter as discussed above.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 15, 26, 33, 40, 56, 66, 70, and 75 as well as claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Combination of Endick with Secondary References

The deficiencies of Endick are not overcome with the addition of secondary references. In particular, claims 4-13, 17-25, 28-32, 34-39, 41-44, 46-54, 59, 62-65, 67-69, 72-74, and 77-79 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Endick in view of Yamaguchi, King, Miesterfeld, Waechter, Jones, Yamada, and/or Tanaka. However, these claims are believed to be allowable at least for the similar reasons as set forth above with regard to Endick. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4-13, 17-25, 28-32, 34-39, 41-44, 46-54, 59, 62-65, 67-69, 72-74, and 77-79 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter accompanying this document is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136 and/or any other relief is required, Applicant hereby petitions for any required relief including Extensions of Time and/or any other relief and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 50-2315 (Order No. 01-3876).

Respectfully submitted,



Peter Hsieh
Reg. No. 44,780

Plantronics, Inc.
345 Encinal Street
P.O. Box 635
Santa Cruz, CA 95060-0635
Telephone: (831) 458-7758
Facsimile: (831) 426-2965